Remarks

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-48 were pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. By this paper, claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 10, 21-22, 25, 27, 35-36, and 41 have been amended. Further, claim 30 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentably distinct from the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5-6, 10, 12, 15, 20-21, 25-26, 30, 32, 35, and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,289,346 issued to Milewski et el. ("Milewski"). However, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Milewski fails to identically teach every element of the pending claims. See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (stating that in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must identically teach every element of the claim).

1. Milewski does not teach a sequence of shared bookmarks that define a personalized path through a media program.

One aspect of the claims of the present application is that a personalized path through a media program can be shared with others without transmitting edited versions of media programs between users. A first user having a playback device can receive bookmarks from a second user having an editing device. The bookmarks allow the first user to use the playback device to navigate along the path defined by the second user using the editing device.

Milewski teaches archiving programs on a network server (see server 120 in FIG. 1) for future access by a user. Col. 1, lines 64-65. The server 120 segments the archived programs into discrete portions and associates a unique universal resource locator (URL) with each discrete portion. Col. 5, lines 28-30. The viewer can communicate to the server 120 the identity of the viewer, the identity of a program of interest to the viewer, and a particular time of interest during the program. Col. 3, lines 10-14. The network server 120 then transmits the corresponding URL to the user's personal computer (PC) 150 or to a personalized web page. Col. 6, lines 12-16. The same user that identified the particular time of the program of interest can then bookmark the URL for future access to the particular portion of the archived program without requiring the user to search the server 120. Col. 6, lines 18-23.

However, by way of contrast with the claims of the present application, Milewski is silent as to transmitting bookmarks that define a ***personalized path through the media program***. Rather, as discussed above, Milewski teaches providing a link to a portion of a program so that the particular portion can be downloaded from the server.

Page 3 of the Office Action suggests that Milewski teaches skipping "from one point of interest to another within the media program in response to a user command (such as by selecting the URL of one bookmarked segment or going to another, col. 6, lines 18-22, in, for example, an archived news program, col. 5, lines 64-67)." However, Applicants respectfully submit that random downloading of individual segments does not in itself teach or suggest the subject matter of the claims of the present application.

For example, amended claim 1 recites, among other things, "generating a ***sequence of bookmarks defining a personalized path*** through the media

program…wherein the sequence of bookmarks is usable by the playback device to ***skip from one point of interest to another within the media program in the sequence defined by the personalized path*** in response to a user command." (Emphasis added). Further, Milewski does not teach or suggest "wherein at least one bookmark ***defines a non-chronological path*** through the media program…wherein the at least one bookmark is usable by the playback device to ***skip from one point of interest to another within the media program along the non-chronological path*** in response to a user command," as recited, among other things, in amended claim 41. (Emphasis added).

2. Milewski does not teach directly transmitting a PIO from an editing device to a playback device.

With respect to canceled claim 30 (now incorporated into amended claim 21), page 3 of the Office Action asserts that "Milewski further discloses that the at least one bookmark is encapsulated within a program interface object (in this case, in HTML format with the bookmark location information stored as a URL and with [ ] associated descriptive text explaining the bookmark, col. 7, lines 33-41)." However Applicants respectfully submit that Milewski does not disclose ***transmitting*** a program information object (PIO) including a bookmark directly from an editing device to a playback device.

Page 2 of the Office Action asserts that Milewski discloses "an editing device (such as a television with upstream communication, col. 7, lines 7-24)." As discussed above, Milewski teaches that the server uses the information it receives from the "editing device" to determine a URL for a program at a particular time of interest as indicated by the received information. Col. 5, lines 24-35. The server then sends the URL (not the information received from the editing device) to the user's PC or to a

personalized web page. Col. 6, lines 18-23. Note that according to page 3 of the Office Action, Milewski teaches a "playback device (such as a computer, fig. 1.150)."

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Milewski is silent as to sending any information directly from an editing device or user input device to a playback device. Further, Milewski is silent as to any of the information sent from the editing device reaching the playback device at all. Rather, the server generates its own information (or already has information stored thereon such as portions of a program) that it sends to the playback device. Thus, for example, Milewski fails to teach or suggest an ***editing device*** comprising "a bookmark transmission component that ***transmits the PIO*** including at least one bookmark; and a playback device having access to the media program, wherein the ***playback device receives the PIO directly from the bookmark transmission component of the editing device***," as recited, among other things, in amended claim 21. (Emphasis added).

Further, Milewski does not disclose the distinct configuration of a PIO recited in amended claim 21. The claimed PIO comprises "one or more attributes including information about the media program and one or more user-selectable actions performable in connection with the media program, wherein the PIO is to be represented by a visual indicator displayable in a graphical user interface to facilitate user interaction with the PIO." As described in the specification, actions correspond to various operations that may be performed on or in connection with a media program represented by the PIO. For instance, one action may schedule the recording of the program by a PVR. Another action may skip to a time or position indicated by a

bookmark during presentation of the media program. Milewski is silent as to such actions.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the cited prior art references, whether considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose each of the limitations in any of the pending independent claims. For at least the same reasons, each of the claims depending therefrom are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims represent patentable subject matter. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Digeo, Inc.

By /Kory D. Christensen/
Kory D. Christensen
Registration No. 43,548

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999